1 2 3 4 5	Bingham McCutchen LLP DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368) CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539) JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890) Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 Telephone: (415) 393-2000 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286		
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant Intel Corporation		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
11	5711VI KAIVEISEV	O DIVISION	
12 13 14 15 16	LAWRENCE LANG, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, Defendant.	No. C-05-2957-MHP STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE FILING DATE FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	IT IS STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THROUGH THEI COUNSEL AS FOLLOWS: Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, Plaintiff Lawrence Lang and Defendant Intel Corporation hereby stipulate that Intel Corporation's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordin or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407 or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied. The parties request this extension of time to answer or otherwise respond because the plaintiffs in <i>Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp.</i> , No. C 05-2743 (BZ)		
26	ones in branch,	2	

1	(N.D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, have filed a petition to coordinate or consolidate		
2	pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407, and the above-styled action has been identified		
3	as a related action to that petition. As a result the outcome of the pending petition will impact		
4	significantly the schedule of this case.		
5	This is the first stipulation between the parties. Because this litigation has just		
6	begun, granting such a stipulation will not have any negative impact on the schedule of this case.		
7	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.		
8	DATED: August 11, 2005		
9	Bingham McCutchen LLP		
10			
11			
12		By:	JOY K. FUYUNO
13			Attorneys for Defendant Intel Corporation
14	DATED: August 16, 2005		
15			
16		Trump, Alioto, Trump and Prescott	
17			
18		Ву:	/s/ Mario N. Alioto
19			MARIO N. ALIOTO Attorneys for Plaintiff
20			Lawrence Lang
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
		2	

1			
2	[PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE DATE		
3	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Intel Corporation's response to		
4	Plaintiff's complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned case		
5	pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section		
6	1407, or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied.		
7	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
8	Dated: August 19, 2005		
9			
10	Honotable Marilyn H. Patel United States District Judge		
11			
12	Judge Marilyn H. Patel		
13			
14	THERN DISTRICT OF CE		
15 16	151 RIC		
10 17			
18			
10 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			